



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/436,146	11/09/1999	JAN C. ZAWADZKI	247/235	6202

22249 7590 02/28/2002

LYON & LYON LLP
633 WEST FIFTH STREET
SUITE 4700
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071

EXAMINER

ALI, MOHAMMAD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

HG

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/436,146	Applicant(s) ZAWADZKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Mohammad Ali	Art Unit 2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

" A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person."

If this application currently names joint inventors, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary in considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

2. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,161,146 issued to Kley et al. ("Kley") in view of US Patent 5,694,551 issued to Doyle et al ("Doyle").
3. Kley renders obvious independent claim 1 by the following:
 - "logging on to a project manager server,..." at col. 2 lines 20-43;
 - "..., one or more organizational,..." at col. 2 lines 1-32;
 - "..., one or more user groups,..." at col. 1 lines 7-17;
 - "defining one or more users associated,..." at col. 1 lines 7-17;
 - "..., associated with at least,..." at col. 1 lines 7-17.

Kley does not explicitly teach defining from the user in an enterprise, but Doyle does teach the user define like as enterprise of data processing for handling the ordering, order tracking and accounting of suppliers at col. 3 lines 24 to col. 6 lines 17.

Thus it would have obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide "the user define of data processing" of Doyle to "group activity network

systems" of Kley in order to have means of user define to a processing system at col. 3 lines 24 to col. 6 lines 17, Abstract, Doyle.

4. Kley renders obvious independent claim 19 by the following:

"a project manager for creating a project,..." at col. 5 lines 23-67;

"one or more internal,..." at col. 5 lines 23-67, Abstract; and

"..., said project manager at col. 5 lines 23-67, col. 1 lines 7-18.

Kley does not explicitly teach the one or more suppliers in an enterprise, but Doyle does teach the suppliers like as enterprise of data processing for handling the ordering, order tracking and accounting of suppliers at col. 3 lines 8-40, Abstract, Doyle.

Thus it would have obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide "the suppliers of data processing for handling the order " of Doyle to "group activity network systems" of Kley in order to have means of supplier processing to the system at col. 3 lines 8-40, Abstract, Doyle.

5. As per claims 2, 3 and 20, "...., interfacing with project management server" at col. 5 lines 23-50.

6. As per claim 4, "user roles include permission and security access rights,..." at col. 5 lines 51-67.

7. As per claim 5, "..., project manger server from a terminal,..." at col. 5 lines 23-67;

"creating a project associated one or more objects,..." at col. 5 lines 23 to col. 6 lines 33.

8. As per claim 6, "project is created using a project tree data,..." at col. 5 lines 13-18.

9. As per claims 7 and 22, "...., tasks, costs, timesheets,..." at col. 1 lines 7-17.

10. As per claim 8, "providing a user identifier to the project management,..." at col. 5 lines 22-67;

"..., one or more projects associated with the user,..." at col. 5 lines 22 to col. 6 lines 33;

"interfacing with the project by viewing objects,..." at col. 5 lines 22 to col. 6 lines 33, Abstract.

11. As per claims 9, 10, 11, and 18, "interfacing with project,..." at col. 5 lines 12-18, and Abstract.

12. As per claim 21, "...., project manager for generating user,..." at col. 5 lines 23-67.

13. As per claim 12, "completing the user define,..." at col. 5 lines 23 to col. 6 lines 33.

14. As per claims 13-17 and 23-26, same as claims arguments above and Kley teaches at, col. 5 lines 23 to col. 6 lines 33, Abstract.

Kley does not teaches about the suppliers and price but Doyle does teaches the suppliers and price of data processing for handling the ordering, order tracking and accounting suppliers at col. 3 lines 8-40.

Thus it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide "the suppliers and price of data processing" of Doyle to "user group activity" of Kley in order to have means order processing in the system at at col. 3 lines 8-40, Abstract, Doyle.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (703) 605-4356. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Mohammad Ali

Patent Examiner

February 21, 2002


JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100